

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated September 8, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0107269 (Rangan et al.) Claims 2-4 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0186887 (Rhoads). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,442 (Domenikos et al.). Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049847 (McArdle et al.). Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of Rhoads and further in view of Domenikos et al.

By the present response, Applicants have canceled claims 5, 9 and 10. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-13 have been amended to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-13 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rangan et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Rangan et al. discloses an Internet Portal being enabled by software executing on an Internet-connected server. The Portal, in response to a log-on by a user, presents a secure and personalized page for and to the user, the personalized page having listed plural Internet destinations enabled by hyperlinks, wherein upon

invocation of a hyperlink by the subscriber, such as by a point-and-click technique, the Portal invokes a URL for the destination, and upon connection with the destination, transparently provides any required log-on information for user access at the destination.

Regarding these claims, Applicants submit that Rangan et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, a plurality of mount files, each mount file including mount image information and a mount type information, a plurality of image/information files indicative of various services, each image/information file including a small-size image representing each of the services and information items relating to the service, each information item relating to a mount type, or where when a small-size image of the image/information file is designated by the user on the mount image information, the image item which mount types coincides with the mount type information in the mount file is displayed. In the §103 portion of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Rangan et al. fails to disclose or suggest where the mount file includes information for identifying the mount type, or the information indicative of the contents of the image/information files including a service menu and the mount type, or the mount type included in the mount being compared with the mount type of each item of the menu included in the image/information file to display a coincident menu item. Therefore, these §102 rejections have been successfully traversed. However, the Examiner asserts that Domenikos et al. discloses these limitations and, therefore, this reference will be addressed here.

Domenikos et al. discloses systems and processes that allow a computer to connect to a server of an Internet site for executing an application program that is stored on a disk linked to that server. Specifically, processes are disclosed that provide a data transport interface for connecting to the server, transport from the server a server address signal representative of a network address of the server, and a path name signal representative of a file system that includes an application program. The process further generates a mount request as a function of the path name signal and transports the mount request to the server to direct the server to provide an array of server file pointers that point to a file descriptor representative of the file system that includes the application program.

The Examiner asserts that Domenikos et al. discloses where the mount file includes information for identifying the mount type at col. 13, lines 65-67. However, these portions of Domenikos et al. merely disclose that a main routine packs a file system name, a mount point name, and a mount type field into a structure. This is not a plurality of mount files, each mount file including mount image information and mount type information, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Domenikos et al. do not disclose or suggest mount image information. Further, these portions of Domenikos et al. do not disclose or suggest a plurality of mount files, or preparing a plurality of mount files.

Moreover, these portions of Domenikos et al. do not disclose or suggest anything related to a plurality of image/information files indicative of various services, each image/information file including a small-size image representing each of the

services and information items relating to the service, as recited in the claims of the present application. The cited portions of Domenikos et al. merely relate to an instruction in a mount procedure and an associated comment giving a description of its function. Further, these two lines in Domenikos et al. do not disclose or suggest anything related to an information item which mount type coincides with the mount type information in the mount file being displayed when the small-size image of the image/information file is designated by the user on the mount image information.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Rangan et al. nor Domenikos et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 8 and 12-13 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 2-4 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of Rhoads. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Rhoads discloses an automated monitoring service that downloads image files (including, e.g., graphic and video files) and audio files from various Internet sites, and checks these files for the presence of embedded digital watermark data. When found, such data is decoded and used to identify the proprietor of each watermarked file. The proprietors are alerted to the results of the monitoring information, often apprising such proprietors of unknown distribution of their

image/video/audio properties. Digital watermarks carry control flags used to control viewing or playback depending on content classification.

Claim 9 has been canceled, therefore rendering this rejection moot.

Regarding claims 2-4, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Rhoads does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Rangan et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where each of the image/information files is made by embedding information items in the small-size image for identifying the service through digital watermarking, or where the information items of the image/information file include a service menu and URLs corresponding to individual items of the menu.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 2-4 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of Domenikos et al. Applicants have canceled this claim therefore rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of McArdle et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

McArdle et al. discloses a method and computerized system for creation, assembling, sending, exchanging and receiving of digital images via an unassisted web browser. The method facilitates secure collaborative work between separated individuals across the Internet.

Applicants submit that claims 6 and 7 are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that McArdle et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Rangan et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the operation by the user is drag and drop of the small-size image of the image/information file, or where the mount file is of an HTML format and when the small-size image/information file is dragged and dropped, a statement defining dropped coordinates and an image/information file name is inserted into the mount file.

Accordingly Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 6 and 7 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. in view of Rhoads and further in view of Domenikos et al.

Applicants have canceled claim 10 therefore rendering this rejection moot. Regarding claim 11, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 8 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Rhoads and Domenikos et al. do not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Rangan et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest linking to a URL of the information item included in the image/information file in accordance with selection of the information item by the user.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 11 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 6-8, 11 and 12 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/867,618

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.40173X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 684-1120